

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of November 24, 2009 is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1-8 have been amended and are currently pending in the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

A revision has been made to the specification, as indicated above. No new matter has been added by the revision. Entry of the amendment to the specification is thus respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cosentino (US 4,702,932). On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giogoli (US 6,557,486) in view of Pentecost (US 6,511,541). Further, on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giogoli in view of Pentecost, and further in view of Hasegawa et al (US 2006/0096527). For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a coating apparatus comprising a rotary drum in which particles to be treated are accommodated, a casing in which the rotary drum is accommodated, and a spray nozzle unit. Claim 1 also recites that the rotary drum is rotatable around an axis inclined with respect to a horizontal line, and has an opening at one end on an inclination upper side. In addition, in the coating apparatus of claim 1, the spray nozzle unit is removably attached to a swing arm, and *the swing arm is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum.*

Cosentino discloses an apparatus for electrostatic coating which, as shown in Fig. 2, includes a coating pan 20 supported by a frame 21, and a support structure 22 having brackets 23 on which atomizers 24 and/or diffusers 25 are mounted by articulated joints 26. However, Cosentino does not disclose a spray nozzle unit removably attached to a swing arm, in which *the swing arm is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum*, as required by independent claim 1.

In this regard, it is noted that on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the bracket 23 of Cosentino corresponds to the swing arm of claim 1, and that the bracket 23 is swingable around a swing pivot such that the atomizers 24 and/or diffusers 25 (*i.e.*, spraying devices) are capable of being moved between an inside and an outside of the coating pan 20. However, it is first noted that Cosentino merely discloses that the support structure 22 has brackets 23 (see column 4, lines 55-56), and does not disclose or remotely suggest that the bracket 23 corresponds to a swing arm which is swingable around a swing pivot, as required by claim 1. Further, while Cosentino discloses that the atomizers 24 and/or diffusers 25 are attached to the bracket 23 by articulated joints 26, Cosentino only discloses that the angle at which the atomizers 24 and/or diffusers 25 are oriented can be adjusted, but does not disclose that the articulated joints 26 correspond to a swing arm that is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum, as required by independent claim 1.

Accordingly, as Cosentino does not disclose a swing arm which is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum, as required by independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Cosentino does not anticipate independent claim 1.

Giogoli discloses a coating device which, as shown in Figs. 1-3, includes a coating pan 1 and a group of spraying nozzles 4 arranged inside the coating pan 1. Giogoli also discloses that the spraying nozzles 4 are arranged on a shaft 5, and that the shaft 5 is connected to a bar 10 by a support frame 7 and an arm 8. Further, Giogoli discloses that the bar 10 passes through a tube 12 which is connected to a support column 14 by a flange 13. As shown in Fig. 3, Giogoli also discloses that the bar 10 is connected to a handwheel 11.

However, Giogoli does not disclose a spray nozzle unit removably attached to a swing arm, in which *the swing arm is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum*, as required by independent claim 1. In this regard, it is noted that on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the support column 14 of

Giogoli corresponds to the swing arm of claim 1, and that the support column 14 is swingable around a swing pivot such that the spraying nozzles 4 are capable of being moved between an inside and an outside of the coating pan 1.

However, it is first noted that Giogoli does not disclose or remotely suggest that the support column 14 is swingable. Rather, Giogoli merely discloses that the support column 14 has a flange 13 which supports the bar 10 and the handwheel 11. Thus, the support column 14 of Giogoli does not correspond to a swing arm which is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum, as required by independent claim 1.

Further, no other portion of Giogoli corresponds to *a swing arm that is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum*, as required by independent claim 1. In this regard, Giogoli only discloses that by rotating the handwheel 11, the bar 10 rotates so that the nozzles 4 are moved within the coating pan 1 (see column 4, lines 3-29), and does not disclose or remotely suggest a swing arm that is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum, as required by independent claim 1.

In addition, as noted by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Giogoli does not disclose a rotary drum that is rotatable around an axis inclined with respect to a horizontal line, as required by independent claim 1. In this regard, the Examiner cites Pentecost as disclosing that the use of a tilted drum is well known in the art, and concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to tilt the drum of Giogoli based on the teachings of Pentecost.

However, like Giogoli, Pentecost also does not disclose a swing arm that is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum, as required by independent claim 1.

Accordingly, as none of the Giogoli and Pentecost references discloses a swing arm that is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of

the rotary drum, as required by independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Giogoli and Pentecost references does not disclose or suggest a swing arm that is swingable around a swing pivot provided at the casing such that the spray nozzle unit is capable of being moved between a position inside of the rotary drum and a position outside of the rotary drum, as required by independent claim 1.

Therefore, for the reasons presented above, it is believed apparent that the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the Giogoli reference and the Pentecost reference taken either individually or in combination. Accordingly, a person having ordinary skill in the art would clearly not have modified the Giogoli reference in view of the Pentecost reference in such a manner as to result in or otherwise render obvious the present invention of independent claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the Hasegawa reference does not cure the defects of the Cosentino, Giogoli and Pentecost references, as discussed above.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as claims 2-8 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koji HASEGAWA et al.

/Walter C. Pledger/

By 2010.05.24 15:53:07 -04'00'

Walter C. Pledger
Registration No. 55,540
Attorney for Applicants

WCP/lkd
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 24, 2010